

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/791,578	PUTMAN, DAVID GEORGE	
	Examiner Emily Bernhardt	Art Unit 1624	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Emily Bernhardt.

(3) _____.

(2) Mr. Hall.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 7 November 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1 in particular

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicants' AF response addresses and overcomes all rejections of the previous action. However a review of the formula in claim 1 show the optional double bond is not present. It was agreed to replace said formula with that appearing in original claim 1. Also, the examiner pointed out that 2 of the newly added substituents for R2 lack descriptive support in the disclosure as originally filed. While certain species may have a urea group or a methanesulfonyl on phenyl this is not enough to support generic claims. Mr. Hall authorized that "alkylsulfonyl" and "-NH-C(O)-NH2" be deleted from claim 1. Also noted to Mr. Hall were missing bonds in the formulas of claims 29 and 36. In view of these needed changes Mr. Hall will be filing a supplemental Examiner's Amendment (via Rightfax) to address these issues. Also a new claim was discussed which would mirror the scope of R2 described in the specification on p.13,par.[47] which would be an independent claim and not objected to by the examiner..